





FILE:

Office: Los Angeles

Date:

OCT 20 200A

IN RE:

Applicant:

PETITION:

Application for Status as a Permanent Resident pursuant to Section 1104 of the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act of 2000, Pub. L. 106-553, 114 Stat. 2762 (2000),

amended by LIFE Act Amendments, Pub. L. 106-554. 114 Stat. 2763 (2000).

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

Self-represented



## INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, you no longer have a case pending before this office, and you are not entitled to file a motion to reopen or reconsider your case.

Ellen C. James

Robert P. Wiemann, Director Administrative Appeals Office

identifying data deleted to prevent conted invariants

**DISCUSSION:** The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the District Director, Los Angeles, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The district director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that, contrary to the findings set forth in the district director's decision, the supporting affidavits and statements she has provided do contain sufficient information to establish her claim to continuous residence in the U.S. during the period in question.

An applicant for permanent resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act has the burden to establish by a *preponderance of the evidence* that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under this section. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e). When something is to be established by a preponderance of evidence it is sufficient that the proof only establish that it is *probably* true. *See Matter of E-- M--*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989). Preponderance of the evidence has also been defined as "evidence which as a whole shows that the fact sought to be proved is more probable than not." Black's Law Dictionary 1064 (5<sup>th</sup> ed. 1979).

The inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e).

In an attempt to establish continuous unlawful residence since before January 1, 1982, as claimed, the applicant furnished the following evidence:

- A Form I-687 Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which was signed by the applicant but not dated;
- An affidavit dated October 10, 1989 from who attests to having employed the applicant as a live-in housekeeper since September 1981. The affiant also indicates that the applicant lives with her daughter;
- An affidavit from who attests to having employed the applicant since January 1982 as a housekeeper one day per week. The affiant also asserts that the applicant has provided assistance with the affiant's handicapped children;
- An affidavit from who attests to having employed the applicant as a housekeeper twice a month since October 1982; and

• A joint affidavit from who who both attest to having employed the applicant as a housekeeper one day per week since October 1981.

In this instance, the applicant has submitted *four* third-party affidavits attesting to *both* her employment and residence in the U.S. during the period in question. Affidavits in certain cases can effectively meet the preponderance of evidence standard. The director has not established that any of the information in the affidavits submitted by the applicant was fraudulent or inconsistent with the claims made by the applicant on the application. As stated on *Matter of E--M--*, *supra*, when something is to be established by a preponderance of evidence, the applicant only has to establish that the proof is probably true. That decision also points out that, under the preponderance of evidence standard, an application may be granted even though some doubt remains regarding the evidence. The documents that have been furnished, including affidavits and letters furnished by affiants and employers who have provided their current addresses and, in some cases, phone numbers and have indicated their willingness to come forward and testify in this matter if necessary, may be accorded substantial evidentiary weight and are sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof of residence in the United States for the requisite period. Moreover, the information included in the employment affidavits is of a specific, personal nature and is not factually inconsistent with that provided by the applicant in her I-687 application or in other documents.

The documentation provided by the applicant establishes, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the applicant satisfies the statutory and regulatory criteria of entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, as well as continuous unlawful residence in the country during the ensuing time frame of January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for legalization under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act.

Accordingly, the applicant's appeal will be sustained. The district director shall continue the adjudication of the application for permanent resident status.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.